

Appl. No. 09/601,010
Amdt. Dated August 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 12, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0090
Customer No.: 26021

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 8, 16, 38-41, 43, 44, 47, 50, 51 and 58-60 are pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1 and 8 are being amended to improve their form. No new matter is involved.

In paragraph 3 which begins on page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 8, 16, 38-41, 43, 44, 47, 50, and 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,609,424 of Sakuragi et al. In paragraph 5 which begins on page 7 of the Office Action, claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakuragi '424 in view of King Jim Co., LTD. (King) (EP0849687 A2). Sakuragi '424 is said to teach everything in claim 51 except a regular character string including a character string representative of at least one of a person's name, an appellation, and a name of a division to which a person belongs. However, King is said to provide such a teaching and is therefore combined with Sakuragi '424 in rejecting claim 51. These rejections are respectfully traversed, particular in view of the amendments being made to independent claims 1 and 8 herein.

In rejecting the claims as anticipated by Sakuragi et al. '424, the statement is made in paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action that Sakuragi discloses a regular printing step of instructing regular printing for printing said regular character string "irrespective of whether or not a character string other than said regular character string is being input or edited (col. 13, lines 39-47)". However a careful review of Sakuragi '424 suggested that such feature is not disclosed by the reference. In any event, independent claims 1 and 8 are being amended in a manner which clearly distinguishes patentable over such reference. In the case of claim 1, for example, the regular printing step is defined as printing a regular

character string image corresponding to said regular character string on a printing object as a print image “without displaying said regular character string image on a predetermined display screen” when said regular printing is instructed. Claim 8 defines an image printing apparatus rather than an image printing method but otherwise in terms of limitations similar to those of claim 1.

In making these amendments, the “display 41” itself is used for many purposes of “display screen” by alternatively switching lines (27-29 of page 40). Therefore, “display screen” is used instead of “display” or “display means”. The amendments being made to the claims are also supported by disclosures in the specification including the following:

“it is not necessary to check or confirm the regular character string by displaying an image thereof on the display screen before printing” (page 5, line 19-22).

“..., there is no need to check on regular text data by displaying an image thereof on the display 4 before printing”
... (page 45, lines 27-29).

“..., since there is no need to display a screen for carrying out the regular printing process in this example, it is not required to save display information, ...” (page 46, lines 14-17).

Although the “identifiers” in accordance with the invention are themselves displayed, the “regular character string image” itself is not displayed on the display screen at the third step of claim 1 and in the third means of claim 8.

Therefore, claims 1 and 8 are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art.

Appl. No. 09/601,010
Amdt. Dated August 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 12, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0090
Customer No.: 26021

Claims 16, 38-41, 43, 44, 47, 50, and 58-60 depend directly or indirectly from and contain all of the limitations of claim 1 or 8 so that such claims also distinguish patentably over the prior art. In the case of claim 51, the addition of the King reference in making the rejection does not overcome the basic deficiencies of Sakuragi '424. Claim 51 depends indirectly from and contains all of the limitations of claim 8 so that such claim also distinguish patentably over the prior art.

In conclusion, claims 1, 8, 16, 38-41, 43, 44, 47, 50, 51 and 58-60 are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: August 31, 2006

By: _____
John P. Scherlacher
Registration No. 23,009
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701